THE REMONSTRANCE
AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

BOSTON, OCTOBER, 1920

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, Nebraska, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Maryland, New Hampshire, Vermont, New Jersey, West Virginia, Texas, Florida, North Carolina, Wisconsin, Ohio, Virginia, Georgia, Alabama and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers for one year can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other Publications of the Association may be obtained from the Secretary, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

EVERY STEP ILLEGAL

Every step taken by the suffragists to secure the bogus ratification of the Federal Suffrage Amendment by the Tennessee Legislature was illegal.

To begin with, the Legislature acted in direct violation of a provision of the State Constitution which expressly forbade any Legislature to act upon any Federal Amendment which was submitted after its own election to office. Even so short a time ago as June of this year, *The Suffragist*,—the organ of the radical wing—conceded that this constitutional barrier blocked any action by the present Legislature, and placed Tennessee, and Florida, which has a similar provision in its Constitution, in a list by themselves, as "States which cannot take action this year, because of Constitutional Provision requiring election to intervene between submission of and action on an amendment." But laws and Constitutions which stand in the way of what the suffragists want do not count; and Governor Roberts was persuaded to convene the Tennessee Legislature in special session, to do the very thing which the State Constitution forbade it to do.

Then, when the ratification resolution was brought before the House, on the 18th of August, a motion to table it was defeated by a tie vote, 48 to 48, with three members absent. A second motion to table it was defeated by the same tie vote. Then came a change when, on a motion for ratification, Representative Burn, who had voted against ratification, shifted his position, and voted for it, making the vote 49 ayes to 47 noes.

Thereupon, Speaker Walker, who was strongly and consistently opposed to ratification, changed his vote to aye, in order to secure the right to move a reconsideration, and the recorded vote therefore stood 50 to 46. It was Representative Burn's one vote that carried the ratification resolution; and it was charged in affidavits printed in the *Nashville Tennessean* and the *Nashville Banner*, and signed by C. C. Wallace, Judge of the City Court of Lewisburg, Tenn., and by Ennie E. Murray of Nashville that, in the interval between the votes, Representative Burn had been offered $10,000 to change his vote. Mr. Burn denied the charge, and declared that it was because his mother wanted him to vote for ratification that he changed his vote. Whatever the actual truth may be, the single vote by which the ratification resolution was given a nominal majority is obviously open to suspicion.

The next dubious and illegal step was taken on the 21st of August, when the suffragists, in the absence of a constitutional quorum, voted down the pending motion for reconsideration by a vote of 50 to 7, and, by a *viva voce* vote directed that the officers of the House certify to the Senate that the House had passed the resolution. This action was taken in the presence of only 59 members. The constitutional quorum was 66; but the suffragists tried to justify the proceedings by the flimsy pretext that, as the matter under consideration was a federal question, the quorum rule did not apply.

Then came what the newspapers described as the "secret coup" of the suffragists. On the 21st of August, Judge Langford of the Chancery Court had issued a temporary injunction restraining Governor Roberts and Secretary of State Stevens from certifying to Secretary Colby that the Legislature had ratified the Amendment. Then, on the 23d of August,

after a night conference between Attorney-General Thompson and Justice Lansden of the Tennessee Supreme Court—at the house of the latter—Justice Lansden issued a writ of supersedeas, setting aside Judge Langford's injunction, and, early next morning, the Governor affixed the State seal to the fraudulent certificate, and mailed it to Washington. The whole transaction was kept secret, and no opportunity was given for a hearing on the injunction.

So, from beginning to end, every step in this pretended ratification was illegal.

If the suffragists had secured thirty-six States for the ratification of the Federal Amendment by straightforward and honest means, THE REMONSTRANCE—however regretfully—would have counseled acquiescence in the result. But to have it secured—or pretended to have been secured—by breaking the laws, overriding the Constitution, and gross fraud is a different thing; and it becomes a plain duty to contest it at every stage to the highest court. Only so can the schemes of unscrupulous politicians be baffled, and the nation be saved from dangerous complications in the elections.

THE HOUNDING OF SENATOR WADSWORTH

The pettiness of the suffrage leaders is not more clearly illustrated in anything than in their persistent attacks upon Senator Wadsworth of New York because he opposed the Federal Suffrage Amendment. The latest charge brought against him, in the *New York Tribune* of July 30, is that "His course with respect to social legislation, even the child labor law, has been profoundly unsatisfactory to those who would better human life."

What are the facts? During the years when Mr. Wadsworth was Speaker of the New York Assembly, the Legislature passed, with Mr. Wadsworth's active support, a series of child labor bills, a workmen's compensation bill, an employers' liability bill, bills strengthening the factory and mining laws relating to sanitary conditions, and the eight-hour law. In the United States Senate, Mr. Wadsworth voted for the Lodge amendment to the revenue bill of 1917, imposing the maximum duty on imports from other countries of goods manufactured by child labor. He voted for the appropriation to make possible the investigation of child labor in the United States. In the crowded closing days of the last session of Congress, he secured a place on the program for the Women's Bureau Bill, which became law. He introduced and passed through the Senate a bill extending the retirement-with-pay privilege to women of the Army Nurse Corps after the completion of twenty years of faithful service. He framed the legislation enacted this year strengthening the position of chaplains in the army; and he secured a favorable report from the Committee on Agriculture on a bill which he introduced, setting up a special commission to study rural and urban home settlement in this and other countries, and to report recommendations to Congress and the State Legislatures. It is true that his vote was not recorded on the Federal Child Labor law of December, 1918; but it was for the excellent reason that he was at that time absent in France, whither he had gone to study conditions in the army, as a preparation for the approaching heavy task of dealing with army reorganization legislation. He sailed November 9, 1918, and returned in January. The child labor law was passed in December. It was legislation of which he fully approved, and for which he would have voted, if he had not been out of the country on public business.

The suffrage opponents of Senator Wadsworth tried to get Frank A. Munsey, owner of the *New York Sun and Herald,* to run as a candidate against him; but Mr. Munsey flatly refused, and, in a signed article in his paper of August 26, he paid this high tribute to the Senator:

> Throughout the trying war period, and the reconstruction days since the signing of the armistice, there has been no better or more faithful worker in the United States Senate than Senator Wadsworth. And every act of his has shown a clear mind, splendid patriotism, real balance, genuine poise, and admirable common sense. Moreover, Senator Wadsworth is the kind of man we should have in public life—a man of fine lineage, liberally educated, of delightful personality and of wide experience in legislation. And he is young and this means much, means courage, initiative, vision, and the capacity for long hours of intense work, means all this and means as well increasing usefulness in the Senate as he further ripens in legislative experience.
>
> Let us get together as a unit, and give our young Senator the full strength of the Republican party vote. He has earned it; he deserves it for what he is, the fine fellow he is, the citizen he is, and for his exceptional capacity for serving his State and the country.

The suffrage campaign against Senator Wadsworth came to an inglorious conclusion at the primaries on the 14th of September. Mrs. Ella A. Boole, feeling herself fully equal to the responsibilities of the Senatorial office, entered the field as a candidate for the nomination and made an active canvass; and George Henry Payne was also a candidate. Mr. Wadsworth's plurality over Mrs. Boole was 168,338 and over Mr. Payne 200,658.

NEW HAMPSHIRE suffragists made a strong "drive" against Senator Moses at the primaries because of his opposition to woman suffrage. The result was that he "came through" with a two to one majority.

SIDE LIGHTS UPON TENNESSEE

EXPERIENCES OF MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-SUFFRAGISTS AT NASHVILLE

Mrs. Albert S. Apsey, Mrs. Edwin Ford and Mrs. Randolph Frothingham, representing the Massachusetts Anti-Suffrage Association; Mrs. William P. E. Wyse, acting President of the Maryland Anti-Suffrage Association; and Miss Mary G. Kilbreth, President of the National Anti-Suffrage Association, arrived in Nashville, August 6th, to do what they could to help the Tennessee Anti-Ratificationists in their fight against the ratification by the Legislature of the Federal Suffrage Amendment.

The Tennessee Antis were organized as a Tennessee Division of the Southern women for the Rejection of the Susan B. Anthony Amendment. Mrs. James S. Pinckard of Alabama was in charge as President of the Tennessee Division; Mrs. George Washington as Vice-President; Miss Josephine Farrell, Secretary, with a Legislative Committee of which Mrs. Charles C. Gilbert was Chairman; and an Executive Committee. Miss Charlotte Rowe and Mr. J. S. Eichelberger had been on the spot for ten days, holding meetings, and doing publicity work. Mrs. Walter D. Lamar, President of the Georgia Division, was also there for a week. Mrs. Ruffin G. Pleasant, wife of ex-Governor Pleasant of Louisiana, and President of the Division of that State; Miss Laura Clay of Kentucky, one of the most prominent State Rights advocates in the country; and Miss Kate Gordon of New Orleans, the last three in favor of suffrage by State action, worked hard with the Antis against ratification.

All the Antis stayed at the Hotel Hermitage, which was the battle-ground of the campaign, outside of the Capitol. The suffragists had headquarters on the third floor. Our headquarters consisted of two rooms on the mezzanine floor, with a spacious gallery overlooking the hotel office and lobby. This lobby was crowded with men and a few suffrage workers all day, and sometimes until two o'clock in the morning.

Before the arrival of the Antis from Massachusetts, anti-suffrage circulars and pamphlets had been sent all over the State. There were over one hundred different varieties. Between thirty and forty thousand pieces of literature were mailed and distributed. The most useful pamphlets were: "The Woman's Bible"; "Dark and Dangerous Side of Woman Suffrage"; "The Force Bills"; "Questions for Mrs. Catt"; "Defamation of the Character of Robert E. Lee"; copies of "The Ballad," taken from "The Masses"; and the revision of the Ten Commandments.

The day after the arrival of the Massachusetts Antis, a reception was given to the visiting anti-suffragists by the Tennessee Division. On Sunday, Mrs. George Washington invited all to her place at Cedar Hill for the afternoon. There the ladies met a number of prominent men, and started the fire which led to a whirlwind campaign, the like of which had never been seen in Tennessee. After that, men began to pour in to headquarters, and lobbying began in earnest. Mr. Frank Stahlman and his father, Major E. B. Stahlman, editors of the *Nashville Banner,* and Mr. Adler, editor of the *Chattanooga Times,* were active on our side.

Governor Roberts called a special session, and the Legislature convened on Monday, August 9th. The suffrage ratification resolution was prepared by Attorney General R. M. Thompson; introduced in the Senate on August 10th by Speaker A. L. Todd; and on August 13th passed by the Senate by a vote of 25 to 4. The night before, a joint hearing was given in the Hall of Representatives before the Committees on Constitutional Convention and Amendments of House and Senate. The speakers were: For ratification, Senator K. D. McKellar, Hon. E. T. Leay and General Charles T. Cates, Jr.; Against ratification, Judge G. N. Tillman, Judge S. F. Wilson, Major Stahlman, Miss Charlotte Rowe and Hon. F. J. Garrett. A feature of the evening was the reading of a letter from Senator Harding, declaring that he would not advise any member of the Legislature to vote for ratification, in the face of the Constitutional provision which inhibits a member from voting for a Federal Amendment unless elected after the passing of such an amendment by Congress. This was the first question discussed in the campaign.

On the 14th of August, Speaker Walker received a telegram from President Wilson, urging ratification, to which he made a courteous but firm reply, which should be remembered as a courageous stand on vital principles, uninfluenced by political expediency.

There were three exciting mornings in the Legislature. Every inch of standing room was taken; and, in spite of the sergeant-at-arms clearing the floor of the Hall of the House of Representatives three times, the women suffragists lobbied openly among the Representatives' desks. All the Antis sat in the galleries. The scenes on the floor were unparalleled in the history of the State. The chairman rapped for order sometimes for fifteen minutes before quiet was restored. After a hard fight, and two roll-calls on a motion to table showing a tie of 48 to 48, the House finally voted to ratify, 50 to 46, the Speaker having changed his vote to "aye" and then moved to reconsider. At the end of two days, which was the time allowed the Speaker to bring up his motion to reconsider, a quorum was lacking, — thirty-six members having left the jurisdiction of the State in an effort to block ratification.

The sudden awakening of the men of the State to the real meaning of

woman suffrage was inspiring. Several men told me that they thought the suffrage amendment was only a part of a huge scheme of the Socialists to disintegrate the Government—that its success meant race war in the South, and Socialism in the North. The feeling of the public was evidently strong on our side. We couldn't walk a block with our roses without being spoken to frequently in a respectful way, such as,—"Hope you'll win"—"We're with you"—"You're on the right side," etc.

We distributed notices of a mass meeting, on the streets, in the moving-picture houses, in the restaurants, etc., for an hour or two one morning, and as a result had an audience of over four thousand persons in the auditorium that night. Petitions flowed in like an avalanche which, afterwards, being sent to the Legislature, were tabled without reading by the suffrage chairman.

Soon after our arrival, we were conscious of spies on all sides. Every telegram which went from or came to our headquarters was read by the other side; and spies watched and listened to all our conversations. We were warned of this by telephone operators. Our most valuable pamphlets were stolen in bulk at night, although our rooms were always locked. Our copies of the "Woman's Bible," "The Ballad" and the "Ten Commandments" were only shown to prominent men, who were incensed by their blasphemy. Mrs. Apsey took charge of the Bible and the most precious pamphlets, and it was no small task to keep them from being stolen by the suffragists. A militant tried to tear the Bible out of the hands of one of our Massachusetts women, and we had several scenes with militants in regard to it.

The Woman's Party is composed of women of abnormal ideas, fundamentally opposed to the normal woman. They are feminists of advanced type, Socialists, and obsessed with the idea of the "female ruler." The methods of the lobbyists were apparent to every one in the hotel. The men talked to us freely of the rotten methods followed, and said every man in the Legislature knew what was going on. It was all so disgusting that I am sure any of our suffragist friends would have turned against the movement if they could have spent a week with us in that campaign.

The morning after the alleged ratification, Alice Paul gave an interview to the "Tennesseean," saying that their success was due to neither party nor politicians, but entirely to women themselves, and that they would work as a Woman's Party for their sex against men. They would work for legislation providing for government care of children, relieving their father of responsibility for the support and education. This part of the interview was left out in later editions.

The suffragists decorated the Capitol inside and out with militant colors, purple, white and yellow; waved flags, with "Votes for Women" pinned on them; wore yellow sunflowers in their hats; draped their figures with yellow satin; grabbed pink roses out of men's buttonholes; sang hysterically; yelled and jumped up and down; flagrantly disobeyed rules to clear the floor; sat on the men's desks, etc. Of course the worst of all was the manipulation of young Burns, by which the "freedom of women" was won.

The campaign against ratification was greatly helped by the American Constitutional League, of which Hon. Charles S. Fairchild is President. Judge Higgins of Nashville is their representative there; and Senator Frick of Maryland, and Judge Oscar Leser gave valuable assistance.

Returning from these painful and disgusting experiences, I feel more strongly than ever that woman suffrage under its present leadership would be an inexpressible calamity to our country. The National Woman's Party, with their socialist-feminist ideas, do not represent the majority of women, but they are the only suffragists with political power. For the good of our country we should try to defeat that machine by every legal method known.

HARRIET A. FROTHINGHAM.

NORTH CAROLINA TURNS IT DOWN

Before the North Carolina Legislature assembled in special session, the suffragists professed to be confident that it would take favorable action on the Suffrage Amendment.

But they were soon disillusioned. On the 11th of August, 63 members of the North Carolina House of Representatives,—a majority of the whole membership—sent the following telegram to the General Assembly of Tennessee:

We, the undersigned, constituting a majority of the General Assembly of North Carolina, do hereby assure the General Assembly of Tennessee that we will not invade its sovereignty by passing the Anthony amendment, and we ask the General Assembly of Tennessee not to force it upon North Carolina.

Then, on the 17th of August, the Senate, by a margin of 25 to 23, voted to postpone action on the Amendment until the next regular session of the Legislature in 1921.

On the 19th of August, the House of Representatives defeated the amendment by a vote of 71 to 41.

In the meantime, the Governor of the State had sent in a message urging ratification; the usual pressure had been exerted from Washington; and Secretary Daniels had hurried on to his home State to press the Amendment; but the legislators had made up their minds, and could neither be coaxed nor driven.

THE *Boston Herald* of Sept. 11 stated that, although the suffrage fight in Tennessee was not waged on party lines "a large element, if not the majority of the Tennessee Democrats, emphatically resent the course taken by Governor Roberts and are lining up to prevent his re-election." That would be a just retribution for his trifling with the Constitution and the laws.

COURT ACTION BY STEALTH

It was by the individual action of Justice Lansden of the Tennessee Supreme Court, and without notice of any kind to the petitioners in Tennessee who had obtained from the Chancery Court an injunction restraining Governor Roberts from certifying ratification of the Suffrage Amendment, that a writ of supersedeas was issued, practically setting aside the injunction. This action was taken by Justice Lansden at his residence, on the night of August 23, on representations made by State Attorney General Thompson; and, the next morning, twenty-five minutes after the Governor received the writ, he had the certificate of ratification signed and in the mail for Washington. This stealthy procedure was kept a close secret until the certificate was actually mailed; and the petitioners who obtained the injunction which was thus summarily set aside without notice, in a formal statement, denounced the "high-handed tactics and unprecedented methods" involved, adding:

This action was taken and the injunction in effect dissolved without any notice whatsoever to the complainants or their solicitors, all of whom live in Nashville and were easily accessible, although the rule of law generally and as stated by competent authorty, and the rule of professional ethics and courtesy, always require that notice be given counsel of the intention to apply to an appellate judge for the writ of supersedeas.

Lawyers who have been consulted stated they hardly believed that such action was taken and acted on by Governor Roberts, as it appeared to them to be at least, if not revolutionary in character, in such violation of established law and procedure as to seem almost incredible.

Immediately after Governor Roberts' action became known, Speaker Seth M. Walker of the Tennessee House of Representatives sent to Secretary of State Colby at Washington the following telegram:

Tennessee has not ratified Nineteenth Amendment. Motion to reconsider House vote was duly entered on journal, and no quorum was present under Constitution of Tennessee on Aug. 21, 1920, when motion to reconsider was attempted to be acted upon. Under decision of Judge Lurton in 87 Tennessee reports, 167, effect of motion to reconsider was to nullify prior vote until said motion was acted on by Constitutional quorum of 66 members. This has not been done. This Legislature has no power to act, and, furthermore, has not acted.

When Secretary Colby, therefore, ventured to reckon Tennessee as the 36th ratifying State, and to make it the basis for his proclamation that the proposed Nineteenth Amendment had become a part of the Constitution, he did so in full official knowledge of the fact that the Tennessee Legislature had not legally ratified the Amendment.

The *Nashville Banner* of Aug. 27 described the proceeding in this editorial, entitled, "Why in the Night?"

Secretary Bainbridge Colby, Associated Press dispatches from Washington say, "was awakened at 3.45 o'clock by Chester L. Cook, a state department employe, who notified him that the Tennessee certification had arrived."

The Secretary, it is further stated, "then called F. K. Nielson, department solicitor, to examine the Tennessee papers, also instructing the solicitor to bring the proclamation to the Secretary's home at 8 o'clock."

Why was there so much "doing in the dark"? Why so much haste attached to the transaction? The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court issued his writ of supersedeas in the injunction suit after night. This was done while the counsel for the complainants slept, without being notified, and as soon as decided, the Governor had, it seems, his certificate ready for the mail box. The correspondent of the *Memphis Commercial-Appeal,* who appears to have been present, says it was in the mail box a half hour after the Chief Justice granted the writ of supersedeas.

It seems a coincidence that Secretary Colby had been notified by wire and was on the alert for its arrival. The man who sat up to get the mail, and awakened the Secretary in the wee sma' hours to inform him that the certificate had arrived, had evidently been instructed to do so. It is not intended to comment on the peculiar procedure and unnecessary haste, but simply to ask if any one outside of the initiated can guess the reason.

When Secretary Colby arrived at his office at 8 o'clock he informed the awaiting suffragettes that, "The seal of the United States has been duly affixed to the certificate and the suffrage amendment is now the nineteenth amendment to the constitution."

THE TENNESSEE RATIFICATION RECORD EXPUNGED

On the 31st of August, the Tennessee House of Representatives, with a quorum present for the first time since August 20, expunged from its journal all record of ratification of the Federal Suffrage Amendment, and voted, 47 to 24, with 20 not voting, to non-concur in the action of the Senate in voting to ratify.

On the 3d of September, Governor Roberts forwarded to Secretary of State Colby, at Washington, a certified copy of the action taken by the House in reconsidering the ratification resolution, expunging from its journal the record of ratification, and voting to non-concur with the Senate in its favorable action on the resolution. The Governor attached to the papers a statement that "the attached paper is a full and correct copy or transcript of all entries appearing on the journal" of August 31, and that the clerk had authority to make and certify the correctness of the transcript which he sent.

The suffragists claim that this action of the House, duly certified by Governor Roberts to Secretary Colby, can have no effect upon the situation, inasmuch as the Secretary had already proclaimed the ratification of the Amendment; but it will be an important part of the evidence which will be used in the courts to prove that the alleged ratification by the Tennessee Legislature, on which Mr. Colby's proclamation was based, is not valid.

TO THE SUPREME COURT

On the 25th of August, Justice Siddons of the District of Columbia Supreme Court, refused to issue the order which had been asked by Charles S. Fairchild, representing the American Constitutional League, requiring Secretary Colby to "show cause" why an injunction should not be issued to restrain him from proclaiming the ratification of the Federal Suffrage Amendment. The Justice ruled that to issue the "show cause" order would be an "unwarranted interference with a purely ministerial action of the Secretary of State."

This decision of Justice Siddons will make it necessary to carry the final adjudication of the validity of the Amendment to the Supreme Court of the United States. Mr. Alfred D. Smith, Mr. Fairchild's attorney, stated that he still hoped to obtain a decision before the November elections. If, however, the appeal should be carried through the District of Columbia Court of Appeals to the Supreme Court, it could not be argued until after the regular meeting of the Court in October, with little likelihood that a decision would be reached before Election Day, November 2. In that event, the women of the country would be legally entitled to vote, with the result that should the Supreme Court later decide against the legality of the Tennessee ratification, the validity of the entire national election would be in question.

A statement published by the American Constitutional League on the 5th of September, outlined four methods to be used to secure a decision from the Supreme Court: First, to appeal litigation as to Tennessee's ratification to the Tennessee Supreme Court, the case to be then appealed or certified to the United States Supreme Court; Second, to bring injunction and mandamus proceedings against election officials to keep women from voting, and thus cause the suffragists themselves to help expedite the case to the highest court; Third, to have the attorney-general of one of the States that have not ratified refuse women the vote and carry the case into the Supreme Court at once on an original jurisdiction in the name of a sovereign State; or, Fourth, to carry to the Supreme Court the appeal from the District of Columbia's Supreme Court's dismissal of an injunction to restrain Secretary of State Colby from proclaiming the amendment's ratification.

A CAUSE FOR REGRET AND SHAME

(Editorial in the *New York Journal of Commerce*, Sept. 3)

Irrespective of opinions for or against woman suffrage, there are a few facts in connection with the past struggle, as well as certain implications of this suffrage extension, that should be borne in mind and carefully thought over by the American people. First of all, the manner and method of the ratification of the amendment was anything but edifying. It is a cause for regret or even shame on the part of right-thinking men and women who are not blinded by partisanship or unbalanced by emotional enthusiasm. There is no question that the advocates of the measure showed their own lack of faith in its popular approval by consistently refusing to allow the matter to be referred to a popular referendum in the States as a guide or advice to the legislative action. The abject cowardice of the legislatures and pliancy to persistent pressure of a lobby or threats of a special interest (for the suffragists were as special an interest as ever has been seen in our entire legislative history) are merely additional proof of the imperative need for a popular appreciation of the low average quality of the membership of many of our State legislative bodies. Democratic government is no longer safeguarded by popular representation as understood and advocated by Washington, or Jefferson, or Lincoln.

A matter of more serious consequence is that of the integrity of the members of the Legislature of Tennessee, who have risked a direct moral stigma by voting for the amendment against the plain provisions of their State Constitution, which provided that no national amendment could be voted upon by the Tennessee Legislature without an intervening general election for its members. It is a rather nice point of moral integrity for the individual for which few people would personally care to incur the responsibility. Even greater is the dullness of moral perception on the part of those leaders of the suffrage forces and those political candidates for office who dragooned the members of the Tennessee Legislature into violating their oaths of office, by which they were bound to uphold, defend and maintain the constitution of their State. Breach of the fundamental law is hardly a guarantee of the proper exercise of the franchise on the part of these same leaders.

LET THE PEOPLE PROTEST

(Editorial in the *Nashville Banner*, Aug. 27.)

The proclamation of the nineteenth amendment by Secretary of State Colby cannot of itself place it permanently in the Federal Constitution.

The eighteenth amendment was attacked in the Supreme Court after its ratification had been proclaimed, but that did not prevent the institution of suits for its overthrow. The suits were unsuccessful, but they failed for lack of merit; the jurisdiction of the court in such cases was established. The alleged Tennessee ratification will be immediately attacked in the courts, and it is hoped that a final decision may be reached before the November election.

The welfare of the nation very strongly demands an early determination of the case; otherwise there will be a dangerous uncertainty attaching to the validity of some millions of votes likely to be cast in many states for presidential electors and for members of Congress. Inextricable confusion and grave danger would grow out of such a condition.

The Banner and many conservative thinkers repeatedly urged that for this reason, if no other, the entirely unnecessary action on the amendment in Tennessee—the regular session of the Legislature meets in January—should be avoided. It is hoped that

the court's decision will be as prompt as possible.

That is the legal status of the matter. There is something else before the people of Tennessee. The methods adopted to force the ratification of this amendment in Tennessee were an outrage on popular rights and an insult to the state that the people should resent in outspoken resolutions now and at the polls later.

The haste and eagerness to overthrow a privilege and right which the state constitution gives the people of Tennessee evinced a most reprehensible spirit, if nothing more. The clause in the state constitution giving this privilege should have been observed until, after proper adjudication, it was declared null. There had been no adjudication. The keen and strenuous desire to set it aside on the ready-furnished opinion of Attorney-General Frank Thompson was disregardful of the popular right in a manner the people cannot fail to disapprove.

But this was only a beginning of the high-handed, overbearing and entirely arbitrary tactics brought to bear in the accomplishment of this alleged ratification. Before the Legislature adjourned it had been determined by the advocates of the amendment that the state constitution as a whole had in this matter no binding effect on either the Legislature or the Governor. It was all brushed aside.

The alleged ratification was made by one vote less than a constitutional majority of the House of Representatives and without a quorum. The state constitution expressly says the Legislature can transact no business without a quorum.

A statement of campaign expenditures by the suffragist organization sent out from Washington said $80,000 was sent to Nashville.

There were reasons lacking only in exact proof to suspect bribery.

But the most disgusting feature of the whole matter was that the decisive vote—that on which ratification was claimed—was cast by a young Representative from the mountains, who had, a few minutes before, voted twice to lay the ratification resolution on the table, and who was carried out of the hall and subjected to violent expostulations, if nothing worse, before he cast his ballot for the amendment.

After all this the Governor was enjoined by a state court from issuing a certificate that the amendment had been ratified. On a writ of supersedeas, sued out over night, without any notice to counsel for complainants, in plain violation of the rules of the Supreme Court, and Supreme Court decisions, this injunction was dissolved and the certification sent hurriedly to Washington.

A GOOD REPLY

When President Wilson, on the 13th of August, sent to Speaker Walker one of his usual "May I not" telegrams, urging the ratification of the Suffrage Amendment "in the interest of national harmony and vigor and the establishment of the leadership of America in all liberal policies," Mr. Walker promptly telegraphed the following reply:

I have the profound honor to acknowledge your wire of August 13. I do not attempt to express the views of other members of the lower House of Tennessee, but speak for myself alone, which on the Anthony amendment are contrary to yours. *You were too great to ask it, and I do not believe that men of Tennessee will surrender honest convictions for political expediency or harmony.*

That last sentence should have given the President food for reflection.

AN OUTRAGEOUS INVASION OF STATE RIGHTS

(Editorial in the *Cincinnati Times-Star.*)

It looks as if the female suffrage amendment has been ratified by the Tennessee Legislature, and that female suffrage would now be imposed on every State, whether it wishes female suffrage or not. The whole thing is an outrageous invasion of States' rights. There never has been anything to prevent women voting in a State except the will of the electorate. That will is now overridden by a small group of hysterical women and a herd of pliant politicians.

Neither Presidential candidate is free from blame in bringing about the present situation. Both Mr. Harding and Mr. Cox thought they saw female suffrage coming and therefore sought to ingratiate themselves with the Amazonian hordes that they visioned on the political horizon. But it must be admitted that Senator Harding did it with less gush than Governor Cox, who appealed to the Legislature of Tennessee in "the name of the Mothers of America."

Now who constituted Jimmy Cox the ambassador of the Mothers of America? And what about the Mothers of America who are opposed to female suffrage, and who are in the large majority?

THE ACTION IN CONNECTICUT

Governor Holcomb of Connecticut called the Legislature of that State in special session Sept. 14, for the single, expressed purpose of passing laws enabling women to register in season to vote in November; but the suffragists disregarded this limitation, and immediately rushed a ratification resolution through both houses. The Governor refused to sign this resolution, on the ground that the action was illegal; but Miss Catherine Flanagan, for the Suffrage Association, secured a copy of the resolution—lacking the Governor's signature—and hurried on to Washington, to tender it to Secretary Colby.

The Governor declared that the Legislature could not act on general business when summoned for a specific purpose, and he called attention to the special emergency which had arisen because, after the Amendment was proclaimed from Washington as adopted and in force, the Tennessee Legislature had reconsidered and refused to ratify the Amendment. Because the Tennessee action, with women voting in November, possibly illegally, would throw doubt and uncertainty upon the election, he announced that he would call a second special session on the 21st of September to act on the Amendment and the registration bills. This he did; and both houses of the Legislature repassed the resolution which they had acted on so precipitately on the 14th.

SECRETARY COLBY REFUSES CORRECTION

A delegation from the Tennessee Legislature, headed by Speaker Walker, waited upon Secretary Colby on the 20th of September, to ask that the final action of the Tennessee House in voting not to concur in the ratification of the Amendment be recognized and announced by the State Department. A certified record of this action, duly signed by Governor Roberts, had been sent to the Department; and there were precedents for the action asked of Secretary Colby, in the course of the State Department with reference to the 14th and 15th Amendments, in announcing withdrawals. But Secretary Colby refused.

The validity of Secretary Colby's proclamation of the ratification of the Amendment rests therefore upon Tennessee as the 36th State, despite the fact that the alleged ratification by that State was reconsidered, and expunged from the records, and ratification definitely refused.

OTHER ILLEGAL RATIFICATIONS

Tennessee is not the only State in which alleged ratifications of the Suffrage Amendment were secured by illegal means.

In West Virginia, an anti-suffrage Senator was expelled, in direct violation of the State Constitution; and the ratification resolution in the Senate, after being defeated on the original vote, and defeated again on reconsideration, was passed on a second reconsideration, in violation of the Senate rules and of all principles of parliamentary law.

In Missouri, ratification was pushed through the Legislature, in spite of this provision of Section 3 of Article II of the Missouri Constitution:

We declare, that Missouri is a free and independent State, subject only to the Constitution of the United States; and as the preservation of the States and the maintenance of their governments are necessary to an indestructible Union, and were intended to co-exist with it, the Legislature is not authorized to adopt nor will the people of this State ever assent to any amendment or change to the Constitution of the United States which may in any wise impair the right of local self-government, belonging to the people of this State.

But the suffragists paid no more attention to this provision of the Missouri Constitution than to that of the Tennessee Constitution, which expressly forbade legislative action on any Federal Amendment without an intervening election.

WHAT THE SUFFRAGISTS WANT NOW

At a conference of the Executive Committee and officers of the National Woman's Party at the home of Mrs. Belmont, on the 10th of September, the $12,000 still wanted for the Tennessee campaign fund was quickly subscribed; and the sentiment was practically unanimous in favor of continuing the party as a feminist organization to contend for the absolute equality of women in politics, industry and all branches of human endeavor. It was decided to hold a convention at Washington, "but the date was left open because of the pending litigation to upset ratification of the suffrage amendment, and the party will continue to exercise its present functions until the suffrage question is finally settled." What the suffrage women want now, and what they propose to work for, Miss Alice Paul, the chairman, explained at length. They do not propose to make a separate party in the sense of the Republican and Democratic parties, "but to continue as a group to fight for the complete equality of women, throwing its influence and voting power against candidates who oppose its program." Miss Paul said further:

It is incredible to me that any woman should consider the fight for full equality won. It has just begun. There is hardly a field, economic or political, in which the natural and accustomed policy is not to ignore women. Men are chosen to fill high Government offices, and the responsible well-paid positions in industry. No comment was excited by the fact that no woman was a member of the Coal Commission for instance, or of the Railway Wage Board, in whose hands lay matters of vital concern to women as housekeepers and as workers.

ALICE PAUL will be shocked to learn that, of the 1326 election officers appointed in Boston for Nov. 2, not one is a woman. There were two women who nobly offered themselves for this service,—possibly influenced by the compensation, which is from $9 to $11 for the day's work; but one of them lived in Melrose and therefore was not eligible; and the other lived in a ward where there was no vacancy. The Election Commissioners declare that women should have more experience than they have at present in election matters before being appointed to work at the polls. If Miss Paul's feelings were outraged because no woman was made a member of the Coal Commission or the Railway Wage Board, what must she think of this?

WHAT SUFFRAGE MEANS IN THE CITIES

(Adelaide Stedman in *Collier's* for Aug. 28)

A woman who has worked for years in what is known as one of the worst districts in New York where, for a girl, the step from foolishness to disaster is a short one, said wearily: "I couldn't recommend my girls to interest themselves in politics down here. The political situation is too impossible. There is nothing decent about it. Ignorant as the girls are, they'd simply be dupes." "But are they interested? Do they discuss things with the men?" "I don't recommend it." She laughed at my astonishment. "You see in this stratum of society there are few polite arguments. If families disagree, somebody is likely to get killed. I've seen plenty of tragedies result from the most trivial disagreements."